	1					AGREEMENT
EVENT TYPE	OBJECTIVES	MRP COMMENT ITEM	OPTION CHOICES	ADVANTAGES	DISADVANTAGES	STATUS
IRRIGATION SEASON						
	To evaluate the effects of					
	irrigated agriculture practices					
	on water quality when water is being applied to fields irrigation					
	season. This includes the					
	impact on water quality caused					
	by runoff from fields during irrigation activites.	Toxicity Exceedance	Monitor at two sites up-stream	in Tentative MRP, Oct. 2005	Ambiguity in locations for 2 sites	
	J	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		,	Does not have a 'stop point' for	
					repeat monitoring Is not meaningful for toxicity that is	
					caused by known sources.	
			Prepare a plan for follow-up		•	
			based on site-specific criteria such as upstream sources,	Allows for site-specific		
			branching of water body,	considerations in	Requires pre-planning for each	
			historical information.	monitoring rationale	site prior to monitoring season	
			Communicate with		does not address toxicity caused by non-registered pesticides, or	
			Landowners and Ag	could address pesticide	other causes of toxicity such as	
			commissioners	management practices	metals	
				Provides another set of diagnostic information		
			Resample at same site	in Tentative MRP, Oct. 2005		
				provides duration (persistence) information		-
		Field Data		(persistence) information		
		Exceedances	Monitor at two sites up-stream	in Tentative MRP, Oct. 2005	Ambiguity in locations for 2 sites	
					Does not have a 'stop point' for repeat monitoring	
					extends time that monitoring crew	
					will need to be out - greater	
			Resample at same site	in Tentative MRP, Oct. 2005 Addresses persistence of the	expense	
				problem		
				greater possibility of		
			Move upstream to identify		extends time that monitoring crew will need to be out - greater	
			source on the same day	monitoring	expense	
					Does not allow for temporal scale	
					of information	
				greater possibility of identifying		
			Move upstream to identify source	source if done on same day -		
			on the same day	possible for field monitoring		
		Chemistry Data Exceedances	Monitor at two sites up-stream	in Tentative MRP, Oct. 2005	Ambiguity in locations for 2 sites	
		Exceedances	Monitor at two sites up-stream	III Teritative WKF, Oct. 2005	Does not have a 'stop point' for	
					repeat monitoring	
					Some results take several weeks for laboratory to produce	
			Resample at same site	in Tentative MRP, Oct. 2005		
				indicates persistence of		
	1			problem Will indicate any pre-		
				existing water quality		
			Evaluate Source Water	problems prior to entering coalition boundaries	more testing/more cost	
	1		Lvaiuate Source Water	Coantion Doundaries	more testing/more cost Difficulties in drawing	
					conclusions based on limited	
	1				number of samples	
				greater possibility of identifying	extends time that monitoring crew	
			Move upstream to identify source	source if done on same day -	will need to be out - greater	
			on the same day	possible for field monitoring	expense Does not allow for temporal scale	
					of information	
			Communicate with		does not address toxicity caused	
			Communicate with Landowners and Ag	could address pesticide	by non-registered pesticides, or other causes of toxicity such as	
			commissioners	management practices	metals	
				Provides another set of		
	1		Prepare a plan for follow-up	diagnostic information		
			based on site-specific criteria			
			such as upstream sources, branching of water body,	Allows for site-specific considerations in	Requires pre-planning for each	
			historical information.	monitoring rationale	site prior to monitoring season	
			•	-	•	